

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 6-9, 11-13, 16-21, 24, 26, 28, and 30 are amended and claims 31-34 are new. Claims 5, and 14-15 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-4, 6-13, 16-24, 26, 28, and 30-34 are now pending in the present application. The claims have not been amended for reasons related to patentability, but are amended to expedite the allowance of this case. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Formal Matters:

Interview Summary Under 37 C.F.R. §1.133

A telephonic interview occurred between Applicants' representative, Michael Lukon and Examiner Joshua Campbell on October 29, 2004. The interview covered the final rejection of independent claims 1 and 13. The Examiner indicated that the final rejection of claims 1 and 13 was not being withdrawn at that time. Prior to the conclusion of the interview Applicants' representative proposed amending the claim language and submitting arguments to overcome the cited art.

II. Claim Rejections

A. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 13 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter claimed as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants have amended claims 13, and 17-19 to remove any ambiguity related thereto. Based on these amendments, Applicants believe that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11, 13-22, 24, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,896, 321 to Miller et al. (hereinafter “Miller”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publ. No. 2002/0065891 to Malik (hereinafter “Malik”).

As amended, claim 1 recites a method for recognizing the correct spelling of a word associated with an email application. The method includes: receiving an indication that a first word has been entered into a first field; broadcasting a notification message if the first word is identified as a new word; receiving an indication that a second word has been entered into a second field, the second word related to the first word; comparing the second word to a word list; indicating that the second word is a correctly spelled word, in response to finding a match between the second word and the word list; and indicating that the second word is an incorrectly spelled word, in response to failing to find a match between the second word and the word list.

Miller does not teach or suggest a method for recognizing the correct spelling of a word as recited by amended claim 1. For example, Miller does not teach or suggest the limitation of **broadcasting** a notification message to another application if the first word entered in a first field is identified as a new word. The Office Action relies on the teaching of Malik to allegedly cure the deficiencies in the teaching of Miller. However, like Miller, Malik does not teach or suggest a method for recognizing the correct spelling of a word, as recited by amended claim 1.

Since neither Miller nor Malik, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a method for recognizing the correct spelling of a word as recited by amended claim 1, the combined teaching of Miller and Malik cannot make obvious Applicants' claimed invention embodied in independent claim 1. Claim 5 is hereby canceled and the rejection thereof is now moot. Further, since claims 2-4, and 6-12 depend from claim 1 and recite additional claim features, the combined teaching of Miller and Malik cannot make obvious claims 2-4, and 6-12. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 1-4, and 6-12 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 13 recites a spell checker for determining whether an entered word is misspelled. The spell checker includes: a custom dictionary containing a word list; a message monitor for receiving a broadcast from an e-mail application that a new word is available; and an automatic word addition module operative to add the new word to the word list, in response to the message monitor receiving the broadcast from the e-mail application that the new word is

available; wherein the broadcast that the new word is available is generated in response to the entry of a displayed name in a TO field of an email note.

Miller does not teach or suggest a method for recognizing the correct spelling of a word as recited by amended claim 13. Miller does not teach or suggest a spell checker including a message monitor for receiving a broadcast from an e-mail application that a new word is available. Nor does Miller teach or suggest an automatic word addition module operative to add the new word to the word list, in response to the message monitor receiving the broadcast from the e-mail application that the new word is available, wherein the broadcast that the new word is available is generated in response to the entry of a displayed name in a TO field of an email note. Thus, Miller fails to teach or suggest a spell checker for determining whether an entered word is misspelled as recited by claim 13.

Again, the Office Action relies on the teaching of Malik to allegedly cure the deficiencies in the teaching of Miller. However, like Miller, Malik does not teach or suggest a spell checker for determining whether an entered word is misspelled as recited in amended claim 13. Neither Miller nor Malik, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a spell checker for determining whether an entered word is misspelled as recited in amended claim 13. Since neither Miller nor Malik, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a spell checker for determining whether an entered word is misspelled as recited by amended claim 13, the combined teaching of Miller and Malik cannot make obvious Applicants' claimed invention embodied therein. Further, since claims 16-23 depend from claim 13 and recite additional claim features, the combined teaching of Miller and Malik cannot make obvious claims 16-23. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 13, and 16-23 is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 24 recites an email application program for sending and receiving email notes including: an email name resolving module operative to determine a displayed name in response to receiving an entered email name; a new email name reporting module operative to broadcast a new resolved name message to at least one module consisting essentially of a spell checker module, auto-completion module, or a smart-tags module, in response to resolving a new email name associated with the displayed name; and an email name cache for storing the displayed name.

Miller does not teach or suggest an email application program for sending and receiving email notes as recited by amended claim 24. The teaching of Malik is again used to allegedly

cure the deficiencies in the teaching of Miller. However, like Miller, Malik does not teach or suggest an email application program for sending and receiving email notes as recited in amended claim 24. In particular, neither Miller nor Malik, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an email application program for sending and receiving email notes including a new email name reporting module operative to *broadcast* a new resolved name message *to at least one module consisting essentially of a spell checker module, auto-completion module, or a smart-tags module*, in response to resolving a new email name associated with the displayed name as recited in amended claim 24.

Miller and Malik, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an email application program for sending and receiving email notes as recited by amended claim 24. Thus, the combined teaching of Miller and Malik cannot make obvious Applicants' claimed invention embodied in amended claim 24. Further, since claims 26, 28, and 30 depend from claim 24 and recite additional claim features, the combined teaching of Miller and Malik cannot make obvious claims 26, 28, and 30. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 24, 26, 28, and 30 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 23, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Malik and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,413 to Beauregard et al. (hereinafter "Beauregard"). The rejections of claims 12, 23, and 30 are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with regard to amended independent claims 1, 13, and 24, the teachings of Miller and Malik, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of these independent claims.

The teachings of Beauregard do not compensate for the deficient teachings of Miller and Malik with respect to claims 1, 13, and 24 discussed in detail above. Claim 12 depends from amended claim 1 and includes all of the recitations specified in claim 1 as well as the additional recitations contained therein. Claim 23 depends from claim 13 and includes all of the recitations specified in claim 13 as well as the additional recitations contained therein. Claim 30 depends from claim 24 and includes all of the recitations specified in claim 24 as well as the additional recitations contained therein. Since Beauregard does not compensate for the deficient teachings of Miller and Malik with regard to independent claim 1, 13, and 24, Beauregard, in combination with Miller and Malik, cannot make obvious their respective dependent claims 12, 23, and 30.

Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-4, 6-13, 16-24, 26, 28, and 30-34 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-4, 6-13, 16-24, 26, 28, and 30-34 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5040.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael T. Lukon
Reg. No. 48,164

Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE